

## Historic Resources Commission Meeting Minutes of February 14, 2007

**Members Present:** Marsha Shortell, Diane Duermit, Alice Coppedge, John Cram, Alice Keller, Scott Riviere, Todd Williams, Amanda Starcher

**Members Absent:** Jay Winer, Rob Moody, Suzanne Jones, Cheryl McMurry, Lupe Perez, Jackson Bebber

**Staff:** Stacy Merten, Curt Euler, Jennifer Blevins

**Public:** William Gordon, Jack Marshall, John Murrell-Kisner, Bruce Arnold, Sid Border, Jody Kuhne, Ben Mansell, Hal Mahan, Alan McGuinn, Bryan Moffitt, John Bell, Joe Tanneberger, Rich German, Jessica Kirby, P. Laine

**Call to Order:** Acting Chair Shortell called the meeting to order at 4:20 p.m. and explained to those present that, there being no quorum, the Commission would proceed with the preliminary reviews until another Commissioner arrived.

### Preliminary Review:

Agenda Item	
<b>Owner/Applicant:</b>	John Kisner
<b>Subject Property:</b>	98 A Flint Street
<b>Hearing Date:</b>	February 14, 2007
<b>Historic District:</b>	Montford
<b>PIN:</b>	9649.17-22-3163
<b>Zoning District:</b>	RM-8
<b>Other Permits:</b>	Building & Zoning
<b>Staff Comments</b>	Ms. Merten showed slides of the subject property and reviewed the staff report. She explained that the precedent Mr. Kisner submitted would not apply because the house on the parcel with the 2-story accessory structure was originally a 2-story house, but that the 2 <sup>nd</sup> story was destroyed by fire.
<b>Applicant(s) or Applicant Representative(s)</b>	John Kisner, project architect, cited another precedent of a 1-story bungalow with a 2-story outbuilding at 63 Pearson Drive. He submitted photographs and a copy of the 1925 Sanborn map. He stated that the map also showed a precedent at 29 Blake Street, but the house and outbuilding are no longer standing. He pointed out the design changes since the last review of the project, including the addition of a 1-story shed storage area to the carriage house. He told the Commissioners that he plans to request flexible development to allow the carriage house and the house addition to

	encroach into the setbacks. He explained that the original outbuilding was built to the property line, but he plans to set it back about 3 feet and stated that the new wing on the house will be placed in the same location as the original wing.
<b>Public Comment</b>	
<b>Speaker Name</b>	<b>Issue(s)</b>
None	
<b>Commission Comments/Discussion</b>	
Several Commissioners noted that the addition to the accessory structure helps to break up the massing and make it more compatible with the proportion of the main house. Commissioner Williams asked for clarification on what would be visible when the project is completed. The Commissioners agreed that it would be appropriate for both the carriage house and the new wing to encroach into the setbacks.	
<b>Commission Action</b>	
None	

Commissioner Starcher entered the meeting room at 4:40 p.m.

**Adoption of Minutes:** Commissioner Riviere made a motion to adopt the January, 2007 minutes as written.

Second by: Commissioner Williams

Vote for: All

### **Public Hearings:**

#### **Agenda Item**

<b>Owner/Applicant:</b>	Joe Tanneberger (Historic Biltmore Village LLC)
<b>Subject Property:</b>	5 Brook Street
<b>Hearing Date:</b>	February 14, 2007
<b>Historic District:</b>	Biltmore Village
<b>PIN's:</b>	9648.19-70-0055, 0106, 1010, 60-9151, 9647.07-79-1994, 2888
<b>Zoning:</b>	CB-II
<b>Other Permits:</b>	Building & Zoning
<b>Staff Comments</b>	Ms. Merten showed slides of the subject property and reviewed the staff report. She clarified the requests for flexible development for encroachment into the setbacks, building size and landscaping and recommended that the landscape plan portion of the application be continued because no final landscape plan has been submitted. She said she feels that the applicant has addressed the previous concerns about varying the structure and window patterns. She explained that the applicant anticipates the tenants may want to make alterations to the approved storefronts and stated that they would bring any such requests back to the Commission for review. She said the individual tenant signage and awnings would be reviewed by staff as minor works. She asked for clarification on the crosswalk material and stated that the lighting and the

	development or joint identification sign would be reviewed under a separate application at a later date. She asked the applicant for clarification on the placement of the pebbledash and other finish materials.
<b>Applicant(s) or Applicant Representative(s)</b>	Joe Tanneberger, the applicant, explained that the face of the building is actually 21 feet from the curb, but the elevated walkway will encroach into the setback by approximately 3 feet. He stated that there would be no problem meeting the required setbacks if there were no flood issues. He said he expects the landscape plan to be completed soon. He passed out copies of a modified parking plan with 157 spaces, revised elevations showing varying muntin patterns and half-timbering. He asked the Commissioners to consider allowing him to make changes to the location of the cross-hatch sections as needed, with the provision that at least 10% would be the cross-hatch type. He stated that the tenants would provide their own awnings and that they would vary in color. Bryan Moffitt, one of the project architects, stated that the walkways on the private property would be brick pavers, but due to NCDOT regulations, they would use stamped, colored asphalt for the crosswalks. Then he passed around and displayed samples of the exterior finish materials including trim moldings, brick, asphalt roof shingles and synthetic stucco. He displayed a window sample and Mr. Tanneberger pointed out that the muntins would be permanently applied to the exterior surface. He said the final roof shingle had not been selected and asked the Commission to approve both samples.
<b>Public Comment</b>	
<b>Speaker Name</b>	<b>Issue(s)</b>
Hal Mahan	Mr. Mahan expressed concern about the structural integrity of the adjacent post office building, loss of access to the parking area behind his building at 3 Brook Street and the loss of a large tree in the proposed development area.
<b>Commission Comments/Discussion</b>	
Acting Chair Shortell told Mr. Tanneberger that the Commission could only approve the design presented and could not allow for changes to the design and materials without review. Ms. Merten said that any such changes would probably coincide with requests for storefront changes so the Commission could review the requests at the same time. Mr. Tanneberger withdrew the request. The Commissioners discussed the roof shingles and approved the "Slateline Victorian red." Commissioner Riviere asked if synthetic stucco had been used on the front of a building elsewhere in the village. No one present could think of an example. Ms. Merten suggested that the pebbledash should be placed on the first level instead of the ground level because the foundation plantings would conceal it. There was discussion about the appearance of the synthetic stucco. Ms. Merten read from the guidelines "new materials may be used if they can simulate the appearance of materials used traditionally." The Commissioners agreed that the samples	

submitted did not resemble pebbledash. Ms. Merten said that synthetic stucco was originally approved for the project at 111 Hendersonville Road with the condition that the applicant submit a sample to staff for review and approval. She said a sample was not submitted and that the application was later amended for the use of pebbledash. Mr. Tanneberger asked what would happen if he couldn't find a synthetic material that the Commission would approve and they answered that he would have to use pebbledash. He asked for a straw vote on whether the Commissioners would approve the stucco as shown on the samples submitted. A majority of those present said they would not approve such a smooth finish because it did not resemble pebbledash. Mr. Tanneberger asked to amend his application to use pebbledash on the front and both sides and the course synthetic stucco on the rear and the Commissioners agreed. Commissioner Cram asked Mr. Tanneberger to amend his application to show a brick water table. Mr. Tanneberger asked for a straw vote on whether the Commissioners would approve the application without that change. A majority of the Commissioners said they would.

## MOTION TO ADOPT FINDINGS OF FACT

Madam Chair, based upon the evidence presented to this Commission, including Exhibit A – preliminary application package dated 11/20/06, including scope of work summary, new construction checklist, existing site survey, parking plan, retail level floor plan, office level floor plan, elevations, streetscape panorama and context panorama; Exhibit B – final review application package dated 1/24/07, including scope of work summary, new construction checklist, village location plan, existing site survey, landscape plan, parking plan, retail level floor plan, office level floor plan, building section, elevations, perspectives, streetscape panorama, context panorama, Exhibit C – revised parking plan dated 2/14/07; Exhibit D – revised elevations dated 2/14/07; Exhibit E – material samples; and the Commission’s actual inspection and review of subject property by all members;

I move that this Commission adopt the following FINDINGS OF FACT:

1. That notice of public hearing on this application was published in the Asheville Citizen-Times on the 31<sup>st</sup> day of January, 2007, and that each owner of real property situated within Biltmore Village and all others within two hundred feet of the subject property were notified of this hearing in the mail on the 31<sup>st</sup> day of January, 2007 as indicated by Exhibits F and G.
2. That at this hearing the applicant and affected property owners were all given the opportunity to offer oral and documentary evidence as well as submit questions to each other, the Historic Resources Commission staff and Commission members.
3. Application is to construct a new 74,964 sq. ft. mixed use structure with a total of 157 parking spaces per attached plans. Structure will be two stories, have a footprint of 43,500 square feet and be 40 ft. tall from 1<sup>st</sup> floor to peak. The structure will be brick and pebbledash on front, east and west façades and course textured synthetic stucco on rear. with Slateline Victorian Red asphalt shingle roof. All colors per the Biltmore Village color palette. Details include: half-timbering, brackets, corner boards, moldings, brick patterns and window and door surrounds. Roof forms will vary along the front façade. Porch surface will be brick and railings and grates will be powder coated aluminum. Windows and doors will be fiberglass, double-hung nine over one. Storefronts will be aluminum. Flexible development request approved to allow the building to be 74,964 sq. feet; setback standard to allow a 12’ front setback and landscaping per approved final plan. **All permits, variances, or approvals as required by law must be obtained before work may commence.**
4. That the *Biltmore Village Historic District Design Guidelines* Books 1, & 3 and the *Biltmore Village Development Plan* were used to evaluate this request, including the Goals for the Biltmore Village Historic District found in Book 1 *General Design Guidelines & Policies*, Chapter 2, pages 7-8, The General Plan & Character of Biltmore Village found in Book 1 *General Design Guidelines & Policies*, Chapter 4, pages 19-20, Site Design found in Book 1 *General Design Guidelines & Policies*, Chapter 5, pages 23-

26 & 32-34, Color found in Book 1 *General Design Guidelines & Policies*, Chapter 7 pages 43-44, Illumination found in Book 1 *General Design Guidelines & Policies*, Chapter 8 pages 45-46, New Construction in Contemporary Styles found in Book 3 *Design Guidelines for New Construction & Additions* Chapter 4, pages 13-15 of the Biltmore Village Historic District Design Guidelines adopted October, 1988 and Proposed Plan and Character of Biltmore Village Chapter 5, pages 53-58 of the *Biltmore Village Development Plan*, May, 1992.

5. This application **does** meet the design guidelines for the following reasons:

1. The façade of the proposed development is articulated into portions similar in scale to the historic facades.
2. Building materials are similar to those used historically.
3. There are multiple entrances and porches oriented to the street with variety and amenities for the pedestrian.
4. The design guidelines allow large scale development with zero setbacks. (This development will be 2' behind sidewalk.)

6. That the action and improvements proposed in the application before us for a Certificate of Appropriateness **are** compatible with the historic aspects and character of the Biltmore Village Historic District.

Motion by: Commissioner Williams

Second by: Commissioner Duermit

Vote for: All

Based upon the foregoing FINDINGS OF FACT and for the reasons set forth therein, I move that a Certificate of Appropriateness be **issued with the condition that the landscape plan and lighting plan will be submitted to staff for review prior to issuance of zoning permit. Signage, awnings and any storefront changes will also be submitted to staff for review.**

Motion by: Commissioner Williams

Second by: Commissioner Keller

Vote for: All

#### Agenda Item

<b>Owner/Applicant:</b>	Ben Mansell
<b>Subject Property:</b>	11 Cumberland Ave.
<b>Hearing Date:</b>	February 14, 2007
<b>Historic District:</b>	Montford
<b>PIN:</b>	9649.17-21-3553
<b>Zoning District:</b>	RM-8
<b>Other Permits:</b>	Building
<b>Staff Comments</b>	Ms. Merten showed slides of the subject property and reviewed the staff report. She told the Commissioners that the doorway is not visible from the street.

<b>Applicant(s) or Applicant Representative(s)</b>	Ben Mansell, the property owner, explained that the exterior wall surrounding the existing single door is made of pressboard and is rapidly deteriorating.
<b>Public Comment</b>	
<b>Speaker Name</b>	<b>Issue(s)</b>
None	
<b>Commission Comments/Discussion</b>	
<p>The Commissioners discussed whether the proposed doors were appropriate. It was decided that they were because the structure appears to be constructed exclusively of salvaged materials and it offers no clear idea if any other type of doors would be more congruous.</p>	
<b>Commission Action</b>	
<p><b>MOTION TO ADOPT FINDINGS OF FACT</b></p> <p>Madam Chair, based upon the evidence presented to this Commission, including Exhibit A – 9 photographs; and the Commission’s actual inspection and review of subject property by all members except;</p> <p>I move that this Commission adopt the following FINDINGS OF FACT:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. That notice of public hearing on this application was published in the Asheville Citizen-Times on the 31<sup>st</sup> day of January, 2007, and that each owner of real property situated within two hundred feet of the subject property were notified of this hearing in the mail on the 31<sup>st</sup> day of January, 2007 as indicated by Exhibits B and C.</li> <li>2. That at this hearing the applicant and affected property owners were all given the opportunity to offer oral and documentary evidence as well as submit questions to each other, the Historic Resources Commission staff and Commission members.</li> <li>3. Application is to replace existing single door entry with salvaged, fixed-in-place, 1920’s style carriage doors. <b>All permits, variances, or approvals as required by law must be obtained before work may commence.</b></li> <li>4. That the guidelines for Windows and Doors found on page 26 in <i>The Design Review Guidelines for the Montford Historic District</i> adopted on December 8, 1999, were used to evaluate this request.</li> </ol> <p><b>Windows and Doors</b>  Windows and doors elicit a sense of proportion, depth, and are typically key design elements. They also exhibit craftsmanship not found today. Attention to details such as the number of panes or the size of panes or panels will contribute to the appropriateness of a rehabilitation. The Historic Resources Commission has adopted the following standards for the rehabilitation of windows and doors:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Adding or changing original window and door openings shall not be permitted on the principal facade. If new uses for the structure require an additional door or a window, these shall be located where they are not visible from a principal street.</li> <li>2. Replacement of windows on an historic building on any elevation with vinyl or aluminum sash shall not be permitted. Replacement of original windows on the front elevation is inappropriate unless the windows are deteriorated beyond repair. Replacement samples must be submitted to the Historic Resources Commission for approval.</li> <li>3. When the Historic Resources Commission has approved solid wood, single pane, true divided light replacement windows. Storm</li> </ol>	

windows or energy panels applied to sash are encouraged.

4. Windows and doors of existing buildings shall retain their original size and dimension.

5. The number and size of panes, mullion, muntin size and all window and door hardware shall be the same as those of the original windows and doors.

6. Window and door surrounds and trim shall match the original door or window surrounds and trim. Replacing sash windows shall not alter original trim. Trim and sills shall not be covered with aluminum or vinyl facing.

7. Replacement doors are permitted only if the door is deteriorated beyond repair. Replacement doors must match original in design, size, and materials. Metal doors are inappropriate.

5. This application **does** meet the design guidelines for the following reasons:

1. Changes are not visible from the street.
2. The original opening suggests a larger door/window.

6. That the action and improvements proposed in the application before us for a Certificate of Appropriateness **are** compatible with the historic aspects and character of the Montford Historic District.

Motion by: Commissioner Riviere

Second by: Commissioner Williams

Vote for: All

Based upon the foregoing FINDINGS OF FACT and for the reasons set forth therein, I move that a Certificate of Appropriateness be **issued**.

Motion by: Commissioner Riviere

Second by: Commissioner Duermit

Vote for: All

### Agenda Item

<b>Owner/Applicant :</b>	Jody Kuhne
<b>Subject Property:</b>	76 Flint Street
<b>Hearing Date:</b>	February 14, 2007
<b>Historic District:</b>	Montford
<b>PIN:</b>	9649.18-21-5940
<b>Zoning District:</b>	RM-8
<b>Other Permits:</b>	Subdivision Approval
<b>Staff Comments</b>	Ms. Merten reviewed the staff report and explained the request for reduction in lot size. She said the zoning ordinance requires a minimum lot area of 5,000 square feet, but that in order to meet the requirement, the lot line would be too close to the garage on the adjacent parcel or the applicant would have to create an odd shaped lot.
<b>Applicant(s) or Applicant Representative(s)</b>	Jody Kuhne, the applicant, told the Commissioners that he became aware of the zoning issue when he applied for his building permit.
<b>Public Comment</b>	
<b>Speaker Name</b>	<b>Issue(s)</b>
John Kisner	Spoke in favor of the applicant's request.



Commission Comments/Discussion
None
Commission Action
<p><b>MOTION TO ADOPT FINDINGS OF FACT</b></p> <p>Madam Chair, based upon the evidence presented to this Commission, including Exhibit A – flexible development request letter; Exhibit B – 4 photographs; Exhibit C – existing site plan; Exhibit D – proposed site plan; and the Commission’s actual inspection and review of subject property by all members;</p> <p>I move that this Commission adopt the following FINDINGS OF FACT:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. That notice of public hearing on this application was published in the Asheville Citizen-Times on the 31<sup>st</sup> day of January, 2007, and that each owner of real property situated within two hundred feet of the subject property were notified of this hearing in the mail on the 31<sup>st</sup> day of January, 2007 as indicated by Exhibits E and F.</li> <li>2. That at this hearing the applicant and affected property owners were all given the opportunity to offer oral and documentary evidence as well as submit questions to each other, the Historic Resources Commission staff and Commission members.</li> <li>3. Application is a request to apply flexible development standards to allow the new lot to be 4,085 square feet. <b>All permits, variances, or approvals as required by law must be obtained before work may commence.</b></li> <li>4. That the flexible development standards found in Sec. 7-11-6(c)(4) of the Unified Development Ordinance were used to evaluate this request. <p>(4) Structures undergoing design review. Structures or lots subject to design review pursuant to this chapter by any official design review board established in this chapter which are found to comply with the applicable design guidelines shall be exempt from the signage, open space, landscaping, off-street parking, setback, building height and building floor area, lot width, and lot area requirements of the underlying zoning district to the extent that those requirements conflict with the applicable design guidelines.</p> </li> <li>5. This application <b>does</b> meet the design guidelines for the following reasons: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The historical development pattern will be maintained.</li> <li>2. The proposed structure is consistent with the footprint of the original house.</li> </ol> </li> <li>6. That the action and improvements proposed in the application before us for a Certificate of Appropriateness <b>are</b> compatible with the historic aspects and character of the Montford Historic District.</li> </ol> <p>Motion by: Commissioner Starcher  Second by: Commissioner Williams  Vote for: All</p> <p>Based upon the foregoing FINDINGS OF FACT and for the reasons set forth therein, I move that a Certificate of Appropriateness be <b>issued</b>.</p>

Motion by: Commissioner Starcher  
 Second by: Commissioner Williams  
 Vote for: All

### Agenda Item

<b>Owner/Applicant :</b>	Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints
<b>Subject Property:</b>	50 Courtland Ave.
<b>Hearing Date:</b>	February 14, 2007
<b>Historic District:</b>	Montford
<b>PIN:</b>	9649.17-20-7196
<b>Zoning District:</b>	RS-8
<b>Other Permits:</b>	Building & Zoning
<b>Staff Comments</b>	Ms. Merten showed slides of the subject property and reviewed the staff report. She read from the guidelines that the design of additions for non-contributing properties “shall be compatible with the size, scale, color, material and character of the neighborhood, the building and its environment.” She noted the need for more information to show the scale of the proposed structure in context with the surroundings. She said new construction should be sited to minimize its impact on existing mature trees and their root systems. She explained that, although the project is an addition, the guideline for new construction of monumental buildings, which states that they should draw from Asheville’s rich architectural heritage for their design, should be referenced for guidance on how an addition to a non-contributing building could fit in with the district. She said a landscape plan would be required for the zoning review and told the applicant that he should submit a copy to HRC as well.
<b>Applicant(s) or Applicant Representative(s)</b>	Rich German, project architect, said that the existing church would block the view of about 90% of the addition. He said it probably would not be visible from West Chestnut Street, and only slightly visible from Courtland Avenue. He said he thinks the addition will fit in well with the neighborhood.
<b>Public Comment</b>	
<b>Speaker Name</b>	<b>Issue(s)</b>
Sid Border	Expressed concerns about the loss of mature trees, the size, orientation and general design of the proposed addition.
Jessica Kirby	Spoke in favor of the project, but expressed concern about the loss of mature trees.
<b>Commission Comments/Discussion</b>	
Several Commissioners expressed concern about the lack of material samples, removal of the trees and the design of the addition. Acting Chair Shortell asked if any of the	

Commissioners would feel comfortable voting on the proposal without further information. One Commissioner signified yes. The Commissioners requested a context map to show the relationship between the church, the roads and other surrounding buildings. There was also concern about the proposed orientation. Acting Chair Shortell recommended that Mr. German work with a design team and he agreed. She appointed the absent Commissioners to the team. Mr. German requested a continuance.

#### **Commission Action**

Commissioner Williams made a motion to continue the hearing until the March 14, 2007 meeting.

Second by: Commissioner Duermit

Vote for: All

### **Preliminary Review:**

#### **Agenda Item**

<b>Owner/Applicant:</b>	Jessica Kirby
<b>Subject Property:</b>	40 Elizabeth Street
<b>Hearing Date:</b>	February 14, 2007
<b>Historic District:</b>	Montford
<b>PIN:</b>	9649.13-13-5452
<b>Zoning District:</b>	RM-8
<b>Other Permits:</b>	Building
<b>Staff Comments</b>	Ms. Merten showed slides of the subject property and reviewed the staff report. She said that the proposed addition was too conspicuous and noted that it would change the essential character of the bungalow.
<b>Applicant(s) or Applicant Representative(s)</b>	Jessica Kirby, the applicant, stated that she found several houses in the neighborhood that have side additions. Ms. Merten told her that if she would provide addresses, staff would research to determine if any were reviewed by HRC and built in accordance with the guidelines.

#### **Public Comment**

Speaker Name	Issue(s)
None	

#### **Commission Comments/Discussion**

Acting Chair Shortell told Ms. Kirby that the proposal doesn't meet the guidelines and is probably not approvable in its current form. She asked if there was any room to put the addition in the rear of the house and Ms. Kirby said no. The Commissioners advised her that it would be best not to pursue the addition unless she could present a design that could be built in accordance with the guidelines.

#### **Commission Action**

None

### Agenda Item

<b>Owner/Applicant :</b> Terri Reynolds <b>Subject Property:</b> 158 Cherokee Road <b>Hearing Date:</b> February 14, 2007 <b>Historic District:</b> Albemarle Park <b>PIN:</b> 9649.15-74-3683 <b>Zoning District:</b> RM-8 <b>Other Permits:</b> Building	
<b>Staff Comments</b>	Ms. Merten showed slides of the subject property and reviewed the staff report. She advised the applicant that the addition of the bare bark rails would not be appropriate because it would be creating a false historical appearance. She also said that the area under the rear deck should be screened with square lattice instead of creating an enclosure and said that the proposed door should be more compatible with the structure.
<b>Applicant(s) or Applicant Representative(s)</b>	William Gordon, project contractor, said that the HVAC equipment would also be screened with lattice. He said he agreed that the rails should not be added to the front. He asked if he would need approval to replace the roof shingles and Ms. Merten said he would need a minor work CA.
<b>Public Comment</b>	
<b>Speaker Name</b>	<b>Issue(s)</b>
None	
<b>Commission Comments/Discussion</b>	
Commissioner Riviere said he appreciated how well the renovation would tie the structure in with the main house.	
<b>Commission Action</b>	
None	

### Agenda Item

<b>Owner/Applicant :</b> Mark & Jennifer Harris <b>Subject Property:</b> 50 Cumberland Ave. <b>Hearing Date:</b> February 14, 2007 <b>Historic District:</b> Montford <b>PIN:</b> 9649.17-11-9893 <b>Zoning District:</b> RM-8 <b>Other Permits:</b> Building	
<b>Staff Comments</b>	Ms. Merten explained that the applicant had originally asked for a final review, but she had shared her concerns with him and he agreed to make the changes. As he was unable to attend the meeting, he asked Ms. Merten to present the project to the Commissioners to see if they had any additional concerns. She showed slides of the subject property and said that the existing building would be removed. She said that she advised the

	applicant that it would be better to have a contractor stick build the structure instead of trying to make a prefabricated building meet the guidelines. She said the size and roof form seemed appropriate. She stated that the dentil molding shown in the drawings would be eliminated. She asked the Commissioners if they thought it would be appropriate to use one over one windows on the accessory structure instead of trying to match the house and asked if they thought there should be windows on the sides. She also asked for their opinion on the proposed doors.
<b>Applicant(s) or Applicant Representative(s)</b>	None
<b>Public Comment</b>	
<b>Speaker Name</b>	<b>Issue(s)</b>
None	
<b>Commission Comments/Discussion</b>	
The Commissioners strongly recommended that the building should be stick-built. There was discussion about the windows and it was decided that the one over one pattern would be appropriate. They recommended the addition of windows on the sides, but said they would not require them. Commissioner Starcher suggested that the roof line should match that of the main house. They agreed that a pedestrian door offset from the center would look best.	
<b>Commission Action</b>	
None	

### Other Business:

#### a. Killian House

Ms. Merten told the Commissioners that the Killian House and the 5 surrounding acres on Beaverdam Road may be acquired by the city to be used as a park. She said that the house may be worthy of landmark status and suggested that a property committee visit the site and report their findings to the rest of the Commission. Commissioner Riviere and Acting Chair Shortell volunteered.

#### b. Sondley Award Nominations

Ms. Merten asked for nominations and said the vote would take place at the March meeting. Grace Pless, Mary Jo Brezney and Jim Coman were nominated. Commissioner Duermit asked for a biography of each nominee.

#### c. Preservation Month

Ms. Merten told the Commissioners about some of the activities planned and asked for their endorsement of a Preservation Month page on the city website. They all agreed and endorsed the idea.

Acting Chair Shortell adjourned the meeting at 7:30 p.m.

--